



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,167	10/23/2003	Kulvir S. Bhogal	AUS920030860US1	1937

35525 7590 08/10/2005

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

CHUNG, DANIEL J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2677

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/692,167

Applicant(s)

BHOGAL, KULVIR S.

Examiner

Daniel J. Chung

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5-25-2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-8,10-14 and 16-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-8,10-14, and 16-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1,4-8,10-14, and 16-23 are presented for examination. Claims 2,3,9, and 15 have been cancelled and claims 20-24 have been added by the amendment filed on 5-25-2005. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 5-25-2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1,4-8,10-14, and 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gaughan et al. (5,589,893)

Regarding claim 1, Gaughan et al discloses that the claimed feature of a computer implemented method for selectively increasing a display intensity of at least one region of a screen, the method comprising: responsive to identifying [i.e. "accessed by cursor" 56] a first region [i.e. 'one of control function are', 'one of screen areas'; 58,60,62,64] on the screen, altering [i.e. "illuminated", "highlighted"] the display intensity of the screen within the first region, wherein, after the display intensity of the first region is altered, the display intensity of the screen within the first region is greater than the display intensity of other regions portions of the screen; determining whether the first region has been redefined ['by cursor movement'] to form a redefined region; and

responsive to the first region being redefined, [i.e. 'another screen areas'] , altering [i.e. "illuminated", "highlighted"] the display intensity of the screen within the redefined region, wherein the display intensity of the screen within the redefined region is greater than the display intensity of other regions of the screen. (See Fig 4, Fig 9, Abstract line 11-17, col 4 line 40-col 6 line 6)

Regarding claim 4, Gaughan et al discloses that determining whether a new window [i.e. "window area"] has become the active window, wherein the new window becoming the active window results in the first region being redefined to form the redefined region. (See Fig 4, Fig 9, col 5 line 27-col 6 line 6)

Regarding claim 5, Gaughan et al discloses that the first regions has a shape selected from one of a circle, a square, or a rectangle. (See 'rectangle shape' in Fig 4)

Regarding claim 6, Gaughan et al discloses that the first region is defined by a number of lines above and below an I-bar in a document displayed on the screen. (See 'window' in Fig 4, 9)

Regarding claims 7-8, claims 7-8 are similar in scope to the claim 1, and thus the rejection to claim 1 hereinabove is also applicable to claims 7-8.

Regarding claims 9-13, claims 9-13 are similar in scope to the claims 2-6, and thus the rejections to claims 2-6 hereinabove are also applicable to claims 9-13.

Regarding claims 14-19, claims 14-19 are similar in scope to the claims 1-6, and thus the rejections to claims 1-6 hereinabove are also applicable to claims 14-19.

Response to Arguments/Amendments

Applicant's arguments filed 5-25-2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, applicant argued that the cited reference (Gaughan) does not disclose "altering a display intensity of a region of a screen and , responsive to a first region being redefined, altering the display intensity of the screen within a redefined region." (See Remarks p.8) Specifically, applicant pointed out that Gaughan does not anticipate claim 1, as illuminating of Gaughan is not the same as changing the intensity of the display in a region, as claimed. (See Remarks p.9) However, in an analogous art, illuminating/highlighting of the display is adjusted by varying the intensity of light illuminating each display area of the display device [i.e. intensity level of brightness value of display]. Therefore, applicant's arguments and amendments do not overcome the previous rejections, as broadly claimed by applicant.

Conclusion

Applicant's response and amendment are not persuasive and the previous grounds of rejection have been maintained. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Chung whose telephone number is (571) 272-7657. He can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays from 7:30am- 5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael, Razavi, can be reached at (571) 272-7664.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

571-273-8300 (Central fax)


Application/Control Number: 10/692,167
Art Unit: 2672

Page 6

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

djc
August 3, 2005



ALMIS R. JANKUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER